

WATER QUALITY M E M O R A N D U M

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 5, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David W. Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2000, 3rd Quarter Water Monitoring, Star Point Mine, C/007/0006-WQ00-3, Task #1127

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [] NO [X]

Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

This report was prepared based on information in File: O:\007006.stp\Water Quality\datacheck2000-4.xls. Table 731.211a in the MRP (Ground and Surface water monitoring schedule for 2000) identifies the monitoring schedule.

Birch Spring and Big Bear Spring are suppose to be monitored on a quarterly basis. Both quality and quantity was reported for Birch Spring and Big Bear Spring for the third quarter. All other springs are monitored from May through September. Most springs are monitored for quality two times per year. If weather conditions do not allow the Operator to monitor in April, water quality samples are to be collected in May and September. As identified in the file, no data has been reported for most of the springs in July. Other springs such as 229, 424, 518 and 751 did not show data for August.. The operator did not send in a notice to the Division to identify failed attempts at access.

Stream data was not reported for July of the second quarter.

Well data was submitted for the Tie Fork Hunting City well in for August and September, but not for July. There was no or questionable data submitted for the other two wells for the third quarter.

There was no data reported for the UPDES sites during September of the third quarter, even though it was required on a monthly basis.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date

Is not specified

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

For the springs.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

There was no irregularities found in the data submitted.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [X] NO []

2nd month, YES [X] NO []

3rd month, YES [] NO [X]

Identify sites and months not monitored:

.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

No discharges recorded for September.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [X] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

As identified in Sections 1 and 6.

Page 3
C/007/0006-WQ00-3
Task ID #1127
April 5, 2004

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

The inspector should check with the operator to see if the data is available, and get the operator to submit it into the Divisions water quality database.

O:\007006.STP\WATER QUALITY\DWDWQ00-3_1127.DOC